

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

CRIMINAL NO. 16-cr-20208

Plaintiff,

HON. VICTORIA A. ROBERTS

v.

D-1 RONALD ALEXANDER,

Defendant.

---

**GOVERNMENT’S SENTENCING MEMORANDUM**

The United States of America, by and through its attorneys, Barbara L. McQuade, United States Attorney, and J. Michael Buckley and Frances Lee Carlson, Assistant United States Attorneys, submits that for the reasons provided below, a sentence of 19 to 24 months’ imprisonment, which takes into account the defendant’s cooperation, is sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve the purposes set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(2).

**I. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

**A. Plea**

On June 21, 2016, the defendant pled guilty pursuant to a plea agreement to one count of conspiracy to commit federal program bribery, in violation of 18

U.S.C. §§ 371 and 666(a)(1)(B). Alexander's guilty plea arises from his participation in a conspiracy to accept illegal kickback payments from school supplies vendor and co-conspirator, Norman Shy. The plea agreement recommended the guideline range to be 24 to 30 months, based on a total offense level 17 and a criminal history category I.

According to the cooperation provisions of the plea agreement, on August 22, 2016, the government filed a motion for downward departure recommending a sentence within the range of 19 to 24 months.

**B. Facts**

Defendant Ronald Alexander was employed by Detroit Public Schools ("DPS") as the Principal of Charles L. Spain Elementary-Middle School ("Spain") from 1998 through March 2016. DPS maintained a list of pre-approved vendors that were authorized to do business with DPS. As part of his duties, Alexander had the discretion to select vendors from the pre-approved DPS vendor list to procure services and supplies for Spain. Alexander was responsible for certifying, or causing to be certified, that all goods and services were received by Spain, which in turn, would cause DPS to issue payment to the vendor.

Norman Shy, doing business as Allstate Sales, Ronan Enterprises, and R.S. Associates, was a pre-approved DPS vendor of school supplies. Sometime prior to May 2009, Alexander selected Shy as a vendor for school supplies for Spain. At some point, Alexander agreed with Shy to submit purchase orders which included goods that he knew were not going to be delivered to Spain and also to knowingly certify fraudulent invoices which included undelivered goods. Alexander's actions caused DPS to issue payment to Shy for undelivered goods. In exchange, Alexander received a "credit" with Shy based on a percentage of the fraudulently-obtained payment Shy received from DPS for undelivered goods. Alexander regularly withdrew from his "credit" with Shy by requesting and accepting checks and prepaid gift cards to use as he wished. In order to make his kickback payments appear legitimate, Shy requested that Alexander provide him with letters on behalf of Spain requesting gift cards or thanking Shy for monetary contributions or gift cards, which he willingly did.

Between May 2009 and June 2014, Alexander corruptly accepted kickbacks on occasions during the 5-year period. The total amount of kickbacks Alexander accepted is approximately \$23,000. Records obtained relating to gift cards accepted by Alexander reveal purchases made at various restaurants, Foot Locker,

Nordstrom, and for car repairs. Shy also wrote checks payable to Alexander totaling approximately \$3,400, as well as checks to pay for carpet and a conference table for Alexander's church.

## **II. SENTENCING GUIDELINE CALCULATIONS**

As reflected in the plea agreement, the parties anticipated a guideline range of 24 to 30 months based on a total offense level of 17. The probation department calculated a guideline range of 37 to 46 months based on a total offense level of 21. The difference in calculation is due to the fact that the probation department applied a four-level increase pursuant to USSG § 2C1.1(b)(3), reasoning that the offense involved a public official in a high-level decision-making position.

As the Court is aware, on August 22, 2016, the government filed a motion for downward departure recommending a sentence between 19 to 24 months based on Alexander's cooperation. As a result, if the Court grants the motion, the inconsistency in calculations would likely be moot.

## **III. SECTION 3553(a) SENTENCING FACTORS**

In determining the appropriate sentence, the Court should not simply rely on the Guideline calculations, but should consider all of the factors in the Sentencing Reform Act and, in particular, those set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a). These factors

include (i) the nature and circumstances of the offense, and the history and characteristics of the defendant; (ii) the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, and provide just punishment for the offense, and (iii) the need for the sentence imposed to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct.

In this case, absent the government's motion for downward departure, a guideline sentence is warranted. However, because the defendant did cooperate with the government, a sentence below the guideline range is appropriate.

**A. Nature and Circumstances of the Offense**

This fraud on DPS and the children of Detroit was a very serious offense. The struggles of DPS have been well-documented in the media: deplorable building conditions; teacher shortages; severe lack of school supplies and equipment; overcrowded classrooms; lack of funding. The list is long. Alexander, as principal of Spain, was entrusted with the responsibility of ensuring that the students at his school were receiving every educational tool and benefit available despite the woefully inadequate resources. Alexander abused the trust placed in him, and made decisions to do business with vendor Norman Shy, motivated by what he *personally* stood to gain, instead of what was best for his students.

To the extent that Alexander characterizes his motivation as altruistic, or that he fraudulently accepted kickbacks from Shy to use “for the kids,” that should be irrelevant. Although the Sixth Circuit has not confronted this issue, other federal circuits have had the opportunity to address similar arguments and have resoundingly declined to consider personal profit motives—or lack thereof—when imposing sentences.

In *United States v. Seacott*, a district court’s departure from the recommended guidelines because the defendant’s motive was not for “self-gain” was reversed. 15 F.3d 1380, 1386 (7th Cir. 1994). Although the district court reasoned that the guidelines did not adequately take into consideration why a defendant would misapply funds, the Seventh Circuit held that an alleged positive motive was “legally insufficient” to warrant a downward departure. *Id.* at 1387. The Court explained that when the drafters of the Guidelines were concerned with adjustment based on profit motive they were careful to specifically direct courts to consider the defendant’s purpose. *Id.*<sup>1</sup> Most importantly, the Court in *Seacott* recognized:

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, citing the offense “Manufacturing Distributing, Advertising, or Possessing an Eavesdropping Device” which directs the court to consider “[i]f the offense was committed for *pecuniary gain*, increase by 3 levels.” U.S.S.G. § 2H3.2(b)(1) (emphasis added).

It makes little difference to the[] victims if [defendants] illegally transfer funds to themselves or third parties, or if they pile up the money in the parking lot and burn it. The same amount of money has been taken from the victim no matter what the fate of the funds.

*Id.*

Other circuits have reached similar conclusions, finding that altruistic motive or lack of pecuniary gain to the defendant is irrelevant in sentencing. In *United States v. Corry*, the defendant argued that she did not experience personal gain from the bank fraud she committed since the money was being used to keep a family business afloat. 206 F.3d 748, 749 (7th Cir. 2000). Again, the Court recognized how irrelevant a charitable motive is: “[T]o the victim, the criminal’s motives are irrelevant. If someone steals your wallet and gives the money in it to the Humane Society, rather than blowing it in Las Vegas, that’s little comfort as you gaze at your empty pocket.” *Id.* at 751. In the Third Circuit, the Court recognized that a defendant is not punished based on who the criminal activity benefits, instead “the Court must focus on the extent of the harm inflicted by the defendant on his victims.” *United States v. Kopp*, 951 F.2d 521, 535-36 (3d Cir. 1991). Similarly, the Eighth Circuit held that a failure to personally recoup

proceeds of a fraudulent scheme does not “provide a basis for a more lenient sentence.” *United States v. Felder*, 225 F. App’x 423, 424 (8th Cir. 2007).

Accordingly, the alleged motive for a crime and who receives the proceeds of a fraudulent scheme is irrelevant. Although a sentencing court can consider any factor when considering a downward departure or variance, the federal circuits have made clear that a defendant’s motive in a crime should not be grounds for leniency. Instead, courts should focus on the victims of the crime, and not any possible benefactors.

Even if Alexander was accepting fraudulent kickbacks and using the illegal proceeds to help his school, his alleged charity was only made possible by fraud committed against taxpayers and the Detroit Public School System. Alexander’s attempt to downplay the seriousness of his corrupt acts by claiming he accepted and spent kickbacks on his students ignores the fact that his so-called charitable acts were being directly funded by the crime for which he now stands convicted. This Court should reject Alexander’s claimed motive for accepting fraudulent kickbacks when considering whether to depart or vary from the Guideline range, and in doing so recognize that charity involves giving away one’s *own* money, not money that belongs to others. To find otherwise would sanction the notion that



corruptly accepting bribes and kickbacks to spend proceeds as one prefers is not a serious offense.

**B. History and Characteristics of Defendant Alexander**

Alexander has no criminal history. The PSR provides a detailed account of Alexander's personal background.

**C. Seriousness of the Offense, Promoting Respect for the Law, Providing Just Punishment, and Affording Adequate Deterrence**

Alexander's corrupt acceptance of kickbacks was not a crime resulting from a single decision or a momentary impulse. He accepted multiple kickbacks in the form of prepaid gift cards over a 5-year period. Alexander's conduct was not spontaneous, but, instead, involved careful coordination and planning, and repeated acts of deceit over a number of years.

In prosecutions such as this, the sentence imposed is important to promote respect for the law. Congress enacted 18 U.S.C. § 666 to "protect the integrity of the vast sums of money distributed through Federal programs from theft, fraud, and undue influence by bribery." S. Rep. No. 98-225, p. 370 (1983). The sentence imposed should reflect this purpose. Alexander was a public official, and was entrusted to serve the DPS honestly, with the best interests of his school in mind. The spectacle of a school principal corruptly using his position for his own

financial benefit or to manipulate the system does untold damage to the faith of our citizens in the education being provided to their children. Undoubtedly, many members of the community are wondering how pervasive this type of corruption is in our educational system.

Given the difficulties of uncovering and prosecuting this type of corruption, the deterrent impact of a prison sentence is also important. The Eleventh Circuit emphasized the important role that prison sentences have in deterring economic-based crimes in *United States v. Martin* when it recognized that “[b]ecause economic and fraud-based crimes are more rational, cool, and calculated than sudden crimes of passion or opportunity, these crimes are prime candidates for general deterrence.” 455 F.3d 1227, 1240 (11th Cir. 2006)(internal citations omitted). Especially in a public corruption case, it is important to send a message that this type of conduct will not be tolerated, and that the penalties for committing crimes such as these are severe.

### **CONCLUSION**

For all of the above reasons, a sentence of imprisonment within the range of 19 to 24 months, is necessary. Such a sentence would serve to adequately punish the defendant for his actions, while taking into account the substantial assistance he provided to the government. In addition, this sentence would promote respect for the law and serve as deterrence for others.

The government further requests that the Court order full restitution, as agreed to by the parties in the plea agreement, in the amount of \$23,000 to Detroit Public Schools.

Respectfully submitted,

BARBARA L MCQUADE  
United States Attorney

s/Frances L. Carlson  
FRANCES L. CARLSON (P62624)  
J. MICHAEL BUCKLEY (P36167)  
Assistant United States Attorneys  
211 West Fort Street, Suite 2001  
Detroit, Michigan 48226  
313-226-9100  
[frances.carlson@usdoj.gov](mailto:frances.carlson@usdoj.gov)  
[michael.buckley@usdoj.gov](mailto:michael.buckley@usdoj.gov)

Date: August 25, 2016

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on Thursday, August 25, 2016, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court using the ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following:

William R. Ford

/s/ Frances L. Carlson  
FRANCES L. CARLSON (P26264)  
Assistant United States Attorney  
211 West Fort Street, Suite 2001  
Detroit, Michigan 48226  
(313) 226-9100  
[Frances.Carlson@usdoj.gov](mailto:Frances.Carlson@usdoj.gov)